

**REMARKS**

Claims 1 and 17 have been amended, and claims 18 and 23-25 were cancelled. Claims 11-15, 19-20 and 22 remain withdrawn from consideration. No new matter was presented via the amendments.

As they stand, the claims are directed to a combination of a rigid accessory ring and a fishing rod, wherein the accessory ring is positioned on the butt or reel seat portions of the fishing rod. The benefit of 1) the rigid ring and 2) the positioning permits not only securing of tackle/hooks via the accessory ring, but also provides for the possibility of attaching a harness or safety line (without ripping apart the accessory ring, since the forces on these lines are often significant). As will be seen below, none of the art cited by the Examiner describe rigid accessory rings attached to the butt portion or reel seat portion of a fishing rod that is configured to attach to fishing tackle or harness or safety lines.

Addressing the rejections, claims 1-10, 16, 17 and 21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 2,556,403 to Sokolik (hereinafter "Sokolik"). Review of Sokolik reveals that it is directed to a fishing hook catch in an accessory ring, but the ring is elastic (Col. 1, line 21) and is slidably adjustable on the pole length (Col. 1, line 6). This accessory ring is not rigid (as required by the claims), is not configured to securely engage a butt portion or reel seat portion of the rod, and would not be able to withstand the forces generated by, e.g., a harness line, but instead would rip off of the pole. Because these limitations are lacking from Sokolik, the claims should be novel over Sokolik. To anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102, a single source must contain all of the elements of the claim. *Lewmar Marine Inc. v. Barient, Inc.*, 827 F.2d 744, 747, 3 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1766, 1768 (Fed. Cir. 1987), *cert. denied*, 484 U.S. 1007 (1988). Reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-10, 16, 17 and 21 have also been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,587,757 to Lirette (hereinafter "Lirette"). Review of Lirette reveals that it is directed to a fishing harness configured to be worn around the

waist of a user, and not to a fishing accessory ring, configured to be securely engaged with a butt or reel seat portion of a fishing rod. Lirette is quite different from the claims at issue. Because these limitations are lacking from Lirette, the claims should be novel over Lirette. To anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102, a single source must contain all of the elements of the claim. *Lewmar Marine Inc. v. Bariant, Inc.*, 827 F.2d 744, 747, 3 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1766, 1768 (Fed. Cir. 1987), *cert. denied*, 484 U.S. 1007 (1988). Reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-9, 16, 17 and 21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Japanese Patent No. 11-346606 to Shoji et al. (hereinafter "Shoji"). Review of Shoji reveals that it is indeed directed to a fishing hook catch in an accessory ring, but the ring is a separate D-ring (A in FIGURE 6), which would not be sufficiently rigid to support a harness line. Indeed, it seems clear that the D-ring system illustrated by Shoji is really only designed to attach to fishing hooks (such as the multiple head hook illustrated in FIGURE 3. This accessory ring is not rigid (as required by the claims) such that it could possibly connect to a harness line, among others, the claims should be novel over Shoji. To anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102, a single source must contain all of the elements of the claim. *Lewmar Marine Inc. v. Bariant, Inc.*, 827 F.2d 744, 747, 3 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1766, 1768 (Fed. Cir. 1987), *cert. denied*, 484 U.S. 1007 (1988). Reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-10, 16, 17 and 21 have also been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 1,719,695 to Ferguson (hereinafter "Ferguson"). Review of Ferguson reveals that it is directed to a fishing rod support configured to bolt to the deck of a boat, and not to a fishing accessory ring, configured to be securely engaged with a butt or reel seat portion of a fishing rod. Ferguson is quite different from the claims at issue. Because these limitations are lacking from Ferguson, the claims should be novel over Ferguson. To anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102, a single source must contain all of the elements of the claim. *Lewmar Marine Inc. v. Bariant, Inc.*, 827 F.2d 744, 747, 3 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1766, 1768 (Fed. Cir. 1987), *cert. denied*, 484 U.S. 1007 (1988). Reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-9, 16, 17 and 21 have also been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 309,028 to Byington (hereinafter "Byington"). Review of Byington reveals that it is directed to a fishing hook retainer that is slidable on the shaft of the fishing rod, and not to a fishing accessory ring, configured to be securely engaged with a butt or reel seat portion of a fishing rod, and certainly not to an accessory ring that could receive or hold a harness safety line, among others. Byington is quite different from the claims at issue. Because these limitations are lacking from Byington, the claims should be novel over Byington. To anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102, a single source must contain all of the elements of the claim. *Lewmar Marine Inc. v. Bariant, Inc.*, 827 F.2d 744, 747, 3 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1766, 1768 (Fed. Cir. 1987), *cert. denied*, 484 U.S. 1007 (1988). Reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-10, 16, 17 and 21 have also been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,026,545 to Duggan (hereinafter "Duggan"). Review of Duggan reveals that it is directed to a basic universal one-piece restraint bracket (e.g., for use with wire rope or cable bracing systems), and not to a fishing accessory ring, configured to be securely engaged with a butt or reel seat portion of a fishing rod, and certainly not to an accessory ring that could receive or hold a harness safety line, among others. Duggan is quite different from the claims at issue. Because these limitations are lacking from Duggan, the claims should be novel over Duggan. To anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102, a single source must contain all of the elements of the claim. *Lewmar Marine Inc. v. Bariant, Inc.*, 827 F.2d 744, 747, 3 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1766, 1768 (Fed. Cir. 1987), *cert. denied*, 484 U.S. 1007 (1988). Reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-10, 16, 17 and 21 have also been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 283,719 to Mosher (hereinafter "Mosher"). Review of Mosher reveals that it is directed to a basic rope hitch bracket, and not to a fishing accessory ring, configured to be securely engaged with a butt or reel seat portion of a fishing rod, and certainly not to an accessory ring that could receive or hold a harness


safety line, among others. Mosher is quite different from the claims at issue. Because these limitations are lacking from Mosher, the claims should be novel over Mosher. To anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102, a single source must contain all of the elements of the claim. *Lewmar Marine Inc. v. Bariant, Inc.*, 827 F.2d 744, 747, 3 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1766, 1768 (Fed. Cir. 1987), *cert. denied*, 484 U.S. 1007 (1988). Reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-10, 16, 17 and 21 have also been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 59,277 to Sawyer (hereinafter "Sawyer"). Review of Sawyer reveals that it is directed to a basic rope hitch bracket, and not to a fishing accessory ring, configured to be securely engaged with a butt or reel seat portion of a fishing rod, and certainly not to an accessory ring that could receive or hold a harness safety line, among others. Sawyer is quite different from the claims at issue. Because these limitations are lacking from Sawyer, the claims should be novel over Sawyer. To anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102, a single source must contain all of the elements of the claim. *Lewmar Marine Inc. v. Bariant, Inc.*, 827 F.2d 744, 747, 3 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1766, 1768 (Fed. Cir. 1987), *cert. denied*, 484 U.S. 1007 (1988). Reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

If there are any fees with regard to this response or otherwise, please charge them to deposit account 06-1130, maintained by the Applicant's attorneys.

Respectfully Submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN, LLP  
Applicant's Attorneys

By:   
H. M. Bedingfield  
Registration No. 44,530

Dated: December 27, 2005  
Address: 55 Griffin Road South, Bloomfield, CT 06002  
Telephone: (860) 286-2929